In defense of religion

Benjamin James

February 14, 2026

To defend religion is to invite confusion from every direction. To some, the term signals a retreat from reason, an apology for superstition, or a refusal to accept the hard-won insights of modern science. For others, defense suggests a rallying cry, an attempt to restore authority, reassert dogma, or protect inherited belief from scrutiny. I will do neither. I will not argue whether religious doctrines are true, miracles occurred, or sacred texts should govern public life. I will begin instead from a simpler observation. Religion is criticized for something it was never primarily meant to be.

Our modern consensus treats religion as an early, now obsolete, attempt to explain the world. Gods are thought to function as mistaken causal agents, myths as primitive science, and rituals as irrational behaviors born of ignorance. On these terms, religion can only be evaluated by the accuracy of its claims about reality, and on those terms, it fails, repeatedly. The verdict, on the surface, seems settled. Whatever value religion once held, it has been superseded by better explanations and more precise tools.

However, this consensus rests on an assumption that deserves closer examination. It assumes religion's central purpose is explanatory, that it offers competing hypotheses about how the universe works, and that its symbols are meant to be taken as literal descriptions of external events. If that were the case, our modern critique would be decisive, but the historical persistence and cross-cultural recurrence of religious forms suggest a different function, one that does not map cleanly onto our categories of true and false.

I propose religion has been misunderstood rather than refuted. Not because its metaphysical claims are secretly correct, but because those claims were never the primary point. Religious traditions developed as ways of orienting human life within forces that exceed individual control, such as seasons, fertility, violence, social order, and death. These forces are experienced collectively, endured collectively, and, to some extent, shaped by collective behavior. Religion offers a means of naming them, responding to them, and coordinating around them. Its symbols do not compete with empirical descriptions of the world; they condense patterns of experience into forms that can be remembered, shared, and acted upon.

To say this is not to excuse the harms done in religion's name, nor to deny that religious authority is often abused. It is to suggest that our common framing of religion as a set of failed truth-claims

misses its more durable role. When religion is criticized solely for being false, the critique assumes a standard it was not designed to meet. When it is dismissed as obsolete, the dismissal overlooks the functions it performs and the conditions under which it emerges. Before deciding whether religion should be rejected, retained, or transformed, it is worth asking whether we have been arguing with the right object at all.

Modern critiques of religion tend to converge on the single accusation that religion makes claims about the world that are empirically and observably false. Gods do not control the weather, prayers do not suspend physical law, and sacred stories do not describe historical events as they purport to. On these points, this critique is often correct. The difficulty lies not in its conclusions, but in the framework used to reach them. Religion is being evaluated as though it were a failed competitor to science, when it was never organized to play that role.

Scientific statements are propositional. They describe states of affairs and can be tested against observation. They are meant to be precise, falsifiable, and revisable. Their authority comes from correspondence; a claim is valuable to the extent that it accurately maps the world. Religion, by contrast, does not operate primarily in this register. Its symbols are not propositions to be verified or refuted. They are orientational devices, designed to shape perception, behavior, and collective response under conditions of uncertainty. To treat them as claims in the scientific sense is to apply the wrong standard to the wrong object.

This distinction matters because it clarifies why many modern objections to religion miss their mark even when they identify real problems. When a myth is dismissed because it does not literally describe how the world works, the dismissal assumes that literal description was the goal. When a god is rejected because no such being can be detected, the rejection assumes that the god was intended as an empirical entity. These assumptions are modern. They reflect a worldview in which truth is narrowly defined as factual accuracy and meaning is located in individual belief rather than collective orientation.

Religious symbols function differently. They compress complex, recurring patterns of experience into forms that can be remembered, transmitted, and acted upon. A myth does not explain why a drought occurs in the way a climatological model does. It situates drought within a broader pattern of dependence, restraint, and consequence. A god of the harvest does not literally cause crops to grow. It names the fragile relationship between human labor, seasonal cycles, and survival, and encodes norms around timing, sacrifice, and care for land. The symbol carries a pattern, not a mechanism.

This can be seen across religious traditions without collapsing them into a single system. Deities associated with seasons or fertility recur wherever human communities depend directly on ecological rhythms. Their stories vary, but the function remains consistent, keeping collective attention oriented toward cycles that are slow, powerful, and unforgiving of neglect. The symbol endures because the pattern it compresses endures. So long as human survival is tied to seasonal regularity, some symbolic form will arise to hold that reality in view.

The same is true of gods associated with justice or order. These figures do not simply enforce rules from above. They encode the insight that social stability depends on norm enforcement that exceeds personal interest. A justice god represents the fact that violations accumulate, unchecked transgression destabilizes the group, and consequences may arrive indirectly or belatedly. The symbol does not explain how norms are enforced in a procedural sense. It reinforces the expectation that they will be, and that they matter even when immediate incentives suggest otherwise.

Chaos and trickster figures reveal another dimension of symbolic compression. These figures appear at the margins of order, disrupting boundaries, breaking rules, and introducing novelty. They are often treated as mischievous or malicious, yet they persist because they encode a recognition that rigid systems stagnate. Innovation, transformation, and adaptation frequently arrive through violation rather than compliance. The trickster names this dynamic, allowing societies to acknowledge and contain it without dissolving entirely into disorder.

None of these symbols function as metaphors in the casual sense, nor are they merely stories told for entertainment. They are durable because they do work. They coordinate expectations, justify practices, and orient collective behavior toward forces that cannot be reduced to individual intention. Their truth is not propositional but functional. A symbol is “true” insofar as it continues to organize perception and action in a way that maintains coherence under pressure.

Modern critiques often falter because they collapse this distinction. By treating symbolic truth as a failed attempt at factual truth, they obscure the role religion played in stabilizing human life across vast stretches of time and geography. This does not absolve religion of its excesses or errors. Symbols can overfit. They can become rigid, exclusionary, and destructive, but those failures occur when symbols cease to track the patterns they once compressed, not because symbolic compression itself is misguided.

If religion is understood as a set of symbolic compressions rather than a catalogue of claims, a different question comes into view. The persistence of these forms across centuries and cultures cannot be explained by ignorance alone. Something about them proved transmissible, adaptable,

and resilient. Our task, then, is to ask how such compressions survived translation across time and place, and what structures allowed them to do so without dissolving entirely into chaos or dogma.

If religious symbols compress patterns of experience, their persistence across time raises a practical question. How are those compressions preserved without becoming brittle or irrelevant? The answer lies in a structural feature common to all scalable human systems, the separation between a stable, transmissible core and the flexible practices that interpret it. In religion, this distinction appears as canon and lived practice. Far from being a secondary concern, it is central to how religious traditions endure.

Canon refers to the body of texts, stories, laws, and symbolic forms that define a tradition's identity. These elements are necessarily generic. They are abstracted from particular circumstances so they can travel across regions, generations, and social conditions. A canon is not a record of how people actually live in all their detail; it is a compact reference that preserves patterns deemed essential. Its function is continuity, not precision. By remaining relatively stable, canon allows a tradition to remain recognizable even as the world around it changes.

Lived practice operates in a different register. It is local, situational, and often inconsistent. It reflects the constraints, pressures, and contingencies of daily life. People do not encounter canon as a closed system but as a set of materials to be interpreted under real conditions of economic scarcity, political threat, ecological variation, and social conflict. As a result, practice is adaptive and often messy. It bends rules, emphasizes some symbols over others, and quietly ignores elements that no longer fit. This variation is not evidence of failure. It is how canon remains usable.

The relationship between canon and practice is frequently misunderstood because modern observers expect uniformity. When we encounter contradictions between doctrine and behavior, or differences between communities that share a tradition, we infer hypocrisy or decay. Yet similar gaps exist in every complex system that must scale. Legal codes articulate general principles, but courtroom practice interprets them case by case. Medical textbooks define ideal procedures, but bedside care adjusts to the particularities of each patient. Engineering specifications describe intended designs, but field improvisation responds to unforeseen conditions. In none of these domains is the gap between rule and application considered anomalous. It is taken as inevitable.

Religion differs mainly in that it makes this gap explicit rather than attempting to erase it. Canon was never expected to dictate behavior mechanically. Its authority lays in preserving pattern identity, not in enforcing identical outcomes. Lived practice, in turn, is not a deviation from the tradition but its

activation. The same symbolic materials generate different expressions because the underlying conditions differ. What matters is not fidelity to form, but continuity of orientation.

This helps explain why religious traditions can appear internally contradictory without dissolving. Apparent inconsistencies often reflect the pressure of local realities on generic forms. A prohibition that is strictly enforced in one context may be relaxed in another without being rejected outright. A ritual that carries great weight in one community may be peripheral in another. These differences are not betrayals of canon; they are interpretations shaped by circumstance. The canon remains intact precisely because it does not specify every detail of its own implementation.

Modernity tends to regard this ambiguity as a flaw. In pursuit of clarity and control, it assumes that a system should operate without interpretive gap; rules should map cleanly onto behavior and ambiguity signals inefficiency or error. Applied to religion, this expectation produces a distorted picture. Canon is read as a set of literal instructions, and lived practice is judged against it as compliance or violation. The result is a false choice between rigid literalism and wholesale rejection.

Historically, religious traditions avoided this trap by accepting that interpretation was unavoidable. Canon provided a stable reference point, but it did not eliminate judgment, negotiation, or adaptation. In doing so, it acknowledged a basic fact of collective life; no abstract framework can fully anticipate the conditions under which it will be used. Attempts to close the gap between rule and reality produce brittleness, not coherence.

This does not mean that all interpretations are equally acceptable or that religious communities lack mechanisms of boundary-setting. Disputes over interpretation have always existed, and they have often been resolved through exclusion and force. These conflicts, however, occurred within a shared understanding that canon alone was insufficient. What was contested was not whether interpretation was necessary, but which interpretations preserved the tradition's orientation under changing conditions.

Seen in this light, the durability of religion owes less to doctrinal rigidity than to structural flexibility. Canon acts as a portable container for symbolic compressions, while lived practice continually translates those compressions into action. The tension between the two is not a problem to be solved, but a dynamic to be managed.

If canon preserves patterns in abstract form, and practice adapts them to particular circumstances, another question follows naturally. Preservation alone does not generate behavior. Something must bring these symbols to life, aligning individuals and groups around them in concrete ways. To

understand that activation, it is necessary to look beyond belief and doctrine to the practices that synchronize attention and coordinate action.

Ritual is often treated as the most embarrassing residue of religion. If beliefs can be reinterpreted symbolically, rituals appear harder to defend. They are repetitive actions directed at unseen forces, performed with solemnity but no obvious causal mechanism. From a modern perspective that privileges individual intention and instrumental efficiency, ritual looks like wasted motion at best and collective delusion at worst. This judgment rests on a familiar assumption that actions are meaningful only insofar as they produce direct, measurable effects on the external world.

Religious ritual does something else. It acts on the group. Rituals synchronize attention. They gather individuals into shared temporal and spatial focus, aligning perception around a common object, story, or moment. This synchronization matters because attention is not evenly distributed by default. Left to itself, it fragments according to personal interest, fear, or desire. Ritual temporarily overrides that fragmentation, producing a shared frame in which collective action becomes possible. The effect does not depend on belief in a supernatural recipient. It depends on participation.

Rituals also align values. By repeating certain gestures, words, or sequences, a community makes visible what it treats as important. What is honored, mourned, celebrated, or forbidden is not left implicit. These priorities are enacted rather than merely stated, embedding them in memory and habit. Over time, this repetition trains expectations of what deserves care, what demands restraint, and what requires response. The ritual does not argue for these values; it installs them through use.

Norm reinforcement follows naturally. Many rituals mark the boundaries between sacred and profane, permitted and forbidden, inside and outside. Participation signals belonging, while abstention or violation carries social meaning. This is not primarily about punishment or reward from a higher power. It is about making norms legible and costly to ignore. When norms remain abstract, enforcement becomes arbitrary. When they are ritualized, they acquire weight through visibility and repetition.

Rituals often redistribute resources as well. Feasts, offerings, tithes, and communal labor redirect surplus in patterned ways. These actions are frequently misread as attempts to appease divine entities through exchange. More accurately, they function as mechanisms for circulating resources, managing scarcity, and reaffirming mutual obligation. The act of giving matters as much as the destination. It makes commitment observable and binds individuals into networks of reciprocity.

Prayer fits this pattern when understood as coordination rather than persuasion. Public prayer synchronizes language and posture, shaping emotional tone and reinforcing shared orientation.

Private prayer, though more inward, still draws on a communal vocabulary and rhythm. In neither case is the primary function to transmit information to an external listener. It is to attune the individual to a collective framework of meaning and expectation.

Sacrifice, similarly, is less about barter than visibility. By destroying or relinquishing something of value, a group demonstrates seriousness. The loss cannot be faked, and its cost is shared or witnessed. This creates credibility where words alone are insufficient. Sacrifice signals that certain commitments override immediate self-interest, a signal that stabilizes cooperation under conditions where trust might otherwise erode.

These functions are not unique to religion. Modern societies perform rituals constantly, though they rarely acknowledge them as such. Elections are ritualized transitions of authority, marked by symbolic acts that stabilize legitimacy beyond the mechanics of voting. Financial markets open and close with ceremonial regularity, anchoring abstract exchanges in shared temporal rhythms. National mourning organizes grief through prescribed gestures, preventing it from dissolving into private isolation. Protests rely on choreography, repetition, and spectacle to convert dispersed discontent into collective presence. Even social media outrage follows ritual patterns, synchronizing attention, reaffirming norms, and punishing transgression through repeated, recognizable forms.

The difference is not that modernity abandoned ritual, but that it denies having any. By refusing to name these practices as rituals, modern societies deprive themselves of the language needed to evaluate, regulate, or revise them. Unacknowledged rituals tend to proliferate unchecked, driven by incentives rather than reflection. Their effects become harder to see precisely because they are treated as spontaneous or purely expressive.

Religious traditions, for all their faults, understand that collective life requires structured repetition. Ritual provides a way to engage forces that cannot be controlled directly but can be responded to together. When these forms are dismissed as superstition, what is lost is not belief in the divine, but a set of tools for coordinating human behavior under shared constraints.

If religion once managed uncontrollable forces symbolically through ritualized coordination, the question that follows is not whether those forces still exist. It is how they are managed now, and what fills the space left behind when such practices are rejected without replacement.

Modernity did not so much overthrow religion as reassign its functions without preserving its interfaces. In rejecting religious frameworks, it discarded the symbolic structures that once mediated between individual life and forces operating at collective scale. What was lost was not

belief in the divine, but a shared language for engaging realities that no single person can control, yet all are subject to. What was kept were the forces themselves.

Markets did not disappear with the decline of religious authority. Bureaucracies did not dissolve. Ecological limits did not recede. Technological systems did not become more transparent or humane. These structures grew more powerful, more complex, and more interdependent. What changed was how they were understood. They were no longer framed as forces requiring collective orientation and ritual management, but as neutral mechanisms governed by technical expertise and individual choice.

This shift produces a peculiar asymmetry. Modern societies retain systems that shape lives at scale while narrowing the vocabulary available to describe their effects. Where religious traditions named and symbolized these forces, modern discourse tends to fragment them into specialized domains. Economics, policy, science, technology, each has its own language and authority. Individually, these languages are precise. Collectively, they fail to provide a shared frame through which ordinary people can situate their experience.

The result is not a return to irrationality, but a form of exposure. Individuals encounter large-scale dynamics without symbolic mediation. Market volatility is experienced as personal instability. Algorithmic feedback loops appear as inscrutable manipulation. Climate patterns register as abstract data until they manifest as disaster. Bureaucratic decisions feel arbitrary because their rationales are dispersed across institutions and procedures no single person can see. In the absence of shared symbolic interfaces, these forces are felt rather than understood.

This exposure has predictable effects. Some people interpret systemic outcomes as chaos; a sense that nothing holds together, that events occur without pattern or reason. Others gravitate toward conspiracy, supplying intentional narratives where structural ones are unavailable. Still others retreat into spectacle, consuming politics and culture as theater rather than participation. Many internalize failure, reading structural constraints as personal shortcomings. These responses differ in form, but they share a common origin, the absence of collective frameworks that once helped people locate themselves within forces larger than the self.

It is tempting to describe this condition as decline, but that framing obscures what is actually happening. Modernity did not strip away meaning in favor of reason. It replaced shared symbolic mediation with technical explanation and individual responsibility, assuming that the former was no longer necessary. This assumption holds in domains where effects are local and reversible. It falters

where consequences accumulate slowly, operate globally, or emerge from countless distributed actions.

Religious traditions addressed these conditions imperfectly, often clumsily, and sometimes violently. They also acknowledged, in their structure if not always in their practice, that certain realities cannot be reduced to personal intention or immediate feedback. Their symbols give shape to dependence, vulnerability, and consequence, allowing communities to respond together to conditions they cannot master alone.

Modernity kept the conditions and rejected the symbols. In doing so, it narrowed the space between individual experience and systemic force without providing new forms of mediation to bridge the gap. The resulting tension is not evidence that people have become less rational or more gullible. It reflects a mismatch between the scale at which life is now organized and the scale at which meaning is made available.

Recognizing this loss does not entail endorsing what preceded it. Nor does it imply that the only alternative is a return to literal belief or rigid authority. The question that arises is more modest and more difficult, whether the rejection of symbolic mediation inadvertently created the very vulnerabilities it sought to eliminate. Addressing that question requires careful separation of function from form, and a clear refusal of false choices between superstition and science, or between rejection and fundamentalism.

Any attempt to reconsider the role of religion in modern life quickly encounters a familiar objection that such reconsideration risks legitimizing fundamentalism. This concern is understandable. Fundamentalist movements present themselves as defenders of tradition and guardians of sacred truth against a hostile world. However, structurally, fundamentalism does not preserve what made religion durable. It disables it.

Fundamentalism arises when symbolic forms are treated as literal territory rather than as compressions of experience. What was once a flexible interface becomes a fixed map. Symbols that once oriented communities toward patterns larger than themselves are frozen into concrete assertions about how the world is and must remain. Interpretation collapses into obedience, and adaptability is recast as betrayal. In this sense, fundamentalism mistakes the container for the contents, the symbol for the reality it once helped navigate.

This move strips religion of one of its essential capacities, the ability to survive translation across changing conditions. Religious traditions endured not because their symbols were immutable, but because those symbols could be reinterpreted without losing their orientational role.

Fundamentalism rejects this flexibility. It demands uniformity of meaning where earlier traditions tolerated variation, and certainty where earlier practices allowed ambiguity. The result is not stability, but brittleness.

Crucially, this brittleness is not a relic of ancient belief. It is a response to modern pressure. Fundamentalist movements tend to emerge in environments where rapid social change, technological disruption, or political instability undermines existing sources of meaning. Under such conditions, symbolic ambiguity feels dangerous. Compression gives way to literalism as a defensive maneuver. What cannot be adapted is instead enforced.

Seen this way, fundamentalism is not an excess of religion, but a failure of it. It abandons the distinction between canon and practice, insisting that abstract forms dictate concrete behavior without mediation. It treats symbolic truth as propositional truth, inviting precisely the kinds of conflicts and refutations that symbolic systems were never meant to endure. In doing so, it exposes religious forms to the very critiques that symbolic compression once avoided.

This inversion matters because it clarifies what is at stake. Defending religion as a functional interface does not entail defending literal belief, centralized authority, or rigid doctrine. On the contrary, literalism undermines the symbolic economy that allows religious traditions to manage complexity in the first place. Where symbols once pointed beyond themselves, fundamentalism insists they point only to themselves. Where interpretation once mediated between pattern and circumstance, obedience now replaces judgment.

Fundamentalism also reflects a distinctly modern anxiety about control. It promises certainty in a world that feels unstable, offering clear boundaries where ambiguity prevails. This promise is illusory. By refusing adaptation, fundamentalist systems intensify the mismatch between symbol and circumstance. When conditions change, as they inevitably do, the system can respond only by doubling down or breaking apart.

Recognizing fundamentalism as a failure mode rather than a defense helps avoid a false dichotomy. The choice is not between rejecting religion outright and accepting its most rigid expressions. Both positions misunderstand the nature of the thing they oppose or defend. One dismisses symbolic interfaces as false explanations; the other mistakes them for literal commands.

If neither rejection nor literalism preserves what makes religious traditions functional, a different question emerges. What remains when belief is decoupled from literalism, and symbolism is neither dismissed nor frozen? Answering that question requires looking beyond doctrine and dogma toward the conditions under which shared meaning can exist at all.

What emerges from this examination is not a program, nor an appeal to revive what has been discarded. It is a shift in how religion is understood, and by extension, how meaning itself is situated. Religion appears less as a collection of beliefs to be accepted or rejected, and more as a set of symbolic interfaces through which human communities once engaged realities that exceeded individual comprehension or control. Removing those interfaces did not remove the realities. It changed how they are encountered.

Human beings do not live solely among facts. We live among patterns that unfold across time, accumulate consequences, and respond to collective behavior rather than isolated intention. Some of these patterns are measurable and immediate. Others are slow, diffuse, or only visible in aggregate. The knowledge required to live within such patterns is not always propositional. It is often enacted, carried in habits, rituals, shared narratives, and expectations that cannot be verified one mind at a time.

Modern culture has invested heavily in individual cognition as the primary site of truth. What can be personally tested, reasoned through, or optimized is granted legitimacy. What cannot is treated with suspicion. This orientation has produced remarkable advances, but it has also narrowed the space in which shared meaning can operate. When meaning is privatized entirely, collective life is left to function without a common interpretive layer. Coordination persists, but without acknowledgement. Consequences arrive, but without names.

Religious traditions once provided a way to hold certain truths collectively without requiring universal agreement on their literal status. A myth could organize behavior even among those who disagreed about its details. A ritual could bind participants regardless of private belief. In this sense, religious truth is not something possessed, but something practiced. It lives between people rather than inside them.

That capacity has not disappeared. It has been displaced. Markets still respond to collective confidence and fear. Technologies still amplify patterns of attention and neglect. Ecological systems still register cumulative action and inaction. Political structures still depend on shared legitimacy. These forces remain responsive, even if the responses are delayed or indirect. What has diminished is our shared symbolic vocabulary through which such responsiveness can be acknowledged without collapsing into blame, fantasy, or denial.

This is not an argument for belief, nor for the authority of tradition. It is an observation about scale. Individual understanding, however refined, is insufficient for navigating realities that emerge only

through collective interaction. Some forms of knowing require shared enactment. They cannot be fully articulated in advance or reduced to optimization problems without losing their substance.

The absence of such forms does not leave a neutral space. It leaves a gap filled by improvisation, spectacle, suspicion, and the projection of agency where none can be clearly located. People continue to act together, synchronize attention, enforce norms, and redistribute consequences. They do so without admitting that these actions carry symbolic weight. The result is a collective life that operates below the level of explicit meaning, powerful but difficult to name.

The forces that shape religious life have not withdrawn. They have only changed their appearance. They still respond to how people gather, what they honor, what they ignore, and what they are willing to sacrifice. What has faded is not our need for shared symbolic interfaces, but the recognition that such interfaces are always already in use. We continue to participate in patterns larger than ourselves, even as we struggle to describe what we are participating in, or why.

References

James, B. (2025). Before the Word, after the Fall. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMBTW

James, B. (2025). Eternity Against Reality; God, the Entropic Epitome of Symbolic Lock-In. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMEAR-7

James, B. (2025). Reality Against the Symbolic; the Structural Struggle of Humanity and Entropy. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMRAT-6

James, B. (2025). Reality's Experiment: Neurotypical Lock-in, Neurodivergent Disruption. Kindle Direct. Audible. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMREN

James, B. (2025). The Symbolic Lock-in of the Self; Reality's Struggle to Understand and Remember Itself. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMTSL-4

James, B. (2025). Symbolic myopia; closure without correspondence. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMSMC

James, B. (2025). Tower of Babel, Mythological Warning Against Symbolic Lock-In. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMTOB-2